(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO)

moved, but treated as before the House for the purpose of discussion. It will be thus seen that the procedure now in vogue in this Assembly has been a matter of gradual evolution, and in existence for 7 years. The difficulties envisaged by a procedure followed earlier has resulted in the emergence of the existing procedure.

As I indicated earlier, there is nothing in the Constitution or in our Rules of Procedure prohibiting the existing practice. This practice is the result of a process of trial and error and has worked quite satisfactorily. I am sure, Honourable Members will agree that instead of putting to the guillotine almost all Demands at the end of the allotted time and taking up for debate only a few selected Demands, it is always better that groups of Demands relating to the same Department or allied subjects are put before the House in a batch so that the Members would be free to discuss any subject which falls within any one of those Demands.

I have examined the practice prevailing in other State Legislatures. I find there is considerable variation. In West Bengal, the Honourable Minister not only makes a motion, but makes a speech indicating the reason for the Demand. In other words, he makes a speech justifying the Demand and setting out in detail the activities of his Department. Thereafter all the cut motions are taken as moved. A general debate ensues, the cut motions are put to vote and the demand is then voted upon.

In Kerala, under their Rules of Procedure, a motion for Demand not only requires to be moved but has also to be seconded. In Madras and Andhra Assemblies, motions are moved by the Minister concerned. In some cases, but motions are taken up individually and discussed and disposed of before the next one is taken up.

There is, thus, no uniform procedure followed. I think that each Legislature has to develop its practice according to its own needs and circumstances. I feel that the procedure that has been evolved in Mysore is most conducive to maximised utility of time for all concerned and is by far the best and most satisfactory, from the point of view of giving members an opportunity for a full and detailed debate on the policies underlying a particular Demand instead of spending the time of the House in discussing cut motions which are after all of limited interest.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE.

2-30 P.M.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Law).—Sir, I beg to lay on the table of the House Notification No. HD 20 CCF 61, dated 29th June 1962 (Passport applications for Kolar District—Affixing of Court Fee Stamps) as required under sub-section (2) of Section 70 of the Mysore Court Fees and Suits Valuation Act (Mysore Act 16 of 1958).

Members' Representation.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ (ಶ್ರವಣಬೆಳಗೊಳ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪಾಲಸಿ—ನೀತಿ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೈನೂರು ದೇಶದ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಧೋರಣೆಗಳೇನಿವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ದೇಶದ ಒಂದು ನೀತಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಪಾಲಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂಥ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ನಿಲುವು ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ಇಂಥ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಗೆಡಹುವುದು ಮೊದಲಿನಿಂದಲೂ ನಡೆದು ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸತ್ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಮೊನ್ನೆ ತಾನೇ ಈ ದೇಶದ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕನ್ನಡವನ್ನು ದೇಶದ ಅಡಳಿತ ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸತ್ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದದ್ದು ಮತ್ತು ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟರಿ ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟಿಸಿಗೂ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪಾಲಿಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯೇನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ಇಂಥ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೆಂದು ಕೇಳುವ ಹಕ್ಕು ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಅವರು ಹೊರಗಡೆ—ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಆ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ